





STATE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION PROGRAM—  
INFORMATION CENTERS

---

---

HEARING

BEFORE THE

PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON  
INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON  
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS  
UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

PURSUANT TO

**S. Res. 40**

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON  
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO EMPLOY TEMPORARY  
ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL AND INCREASING THE LIMIT  
OF EXPENDITURES

---

APRIL 24, 1953

---

PART 4

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1953

Boston Public Library  
Superintendent of Documents

SEP 10 1953

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, Wisconsin, *Chairman*

KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota

MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Maine

HENRY C. DWORSHAK, Idaho

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland

CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan

JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas

CLYDE R. HOEY, North Carolina

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota

HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington

JOHN F. KENNEDY, Massachusetts

STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri

WALTER L. REYNOLDS, *Chief Clerk*

---

PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, Wisconsin, *Chairman*

KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois

CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan

JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas

HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington

STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri

ROY M. COHN, *Chief Counsel*

FRANCIS D. FLANAGAN, *General Counsel and Staff Director*

## CONTENTS

---

	Page
Appendix.....	282
Index.....	I
Testimony of—	
Wechsler, James A., editor, New York Post, New York, N. Y.....	253

### EXHIBITS

	Introduced on page	Appears on page
15. Excerpt from Congressional Record, June 9, 1952.....	256	282
16. Editorial from New York Post, January 23, 1950.....	261	283
17. Letter from Congressman Richard Nixon to James Wechsler, January 30, 1950.....	261	285
18. Book, Labor Baron, by James A. Wechsler.....	268	(*)
19. Book, War Propaganda and the United States, by Harold Lavine and James A. Wechsler.....	270	(*)
20. Excerpt from New York Times, June 15, 1946.....	272	285
21. Excerpt from Daily Worker, December 22, 1942.....	272	287

\*May be found in the files of the subcommittee.



# STATE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION PROGRAM— Information Centers

FRIDAY, APRIL 24, 1953

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS  
OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The subcommittee met (pursuant to S. Res. 40, agreed to January 30, 1953) at 4:10 p. m., in room 357 of the Senate Office Building, Senator Joseph R. McCarthy (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Republican, Wisconsin; Senator John L. McClellan, Democrat, Arkansas; Senator Henry M. Jackson, Democrat, Washington.

Also present: Roy Cohn, chief counsel; Donald Surine, assistant counsel; David Schine, chief consultant; Daniel G. Buckley, assistant counsel; Howard Rushmore, research director; Ruth Young Watt, chief clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you stand and raise your right hand? In this matter now in hearing, do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. WECHSLER. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you have the record show that permission was received from the Senate that this committee sit this afternoon.

Mr. Wechsler, we are sorry we kept you waiting, but there originally was an objection to this committee sitting this afternoon by Senator Morse, and we had to wait for permission to sit.

Mr. WECHSLER. I understand, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I may say the reason for your being called today is that you are one of the many authors of books whose books have been used in the information program in various libraries, and we would like to check into a number of matters. Mr. Cohn will do the questioning.

Mr. COHN. Mr. Wechsler, can you tell us how many books you have written?

## TESTIMONY OF JAMES A. WECHSLER

Mr. WECHSLER. I have written four books.

Mr. COHN. Will you give us their titles?

Mr. WECHSLER. I wrote a book called *Revolt on the Campus*.

Mr. COHN. And the approximate year? Was that 1934?

Mr. WECHSLER. That was published, I believe, in 1935. I wrote a book or was coauthor of a book called *War, Our Heritage*, in 1937. I was author of a book called *War Propaganda and the United States*, or coauthor, again, in 1940, and I was author of a book called *Labor*

Baron, the biography of John L. Lewis, that was published, I believe, in 1945.

The CHAIRMAN. I think I missed one of the books. Revolt on the Campus, War, Our Heritage—

Mr. WECHSLER. War Propaganda and the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. War Propaganda and the United States.

Senator JACKSON. What was that last? What year?

Mr. WECHSLER. That was 1940, Senator.

Mr. COHN. Did you say you were coauthor of War, Our Heritage?

Mr. WECHSLER. That is right.

Mr. COHN. Who was the other coauthor?

Mr. WECHSLER. Joseph R. Lash.

The CHAIRMAN. Revolt on the Campus, 1934?

Mr. WECHSLER. 1935.

The CHAIRMAN. War, Our Heritage? What year was that?

Mr. WECHSLER. I believe that was either 1936 or 1937.

The CHAIRMAN. And War Propaganda and the United States?

Mr. WECHSLER. 1940.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you the sole author of that?

Mr. WECHSLER. No; I was the coauthor with Harold Lavine—

L-a-v-i-n-e.

The CHAIRMAN. And Labor Baron? What year was that?

Mr. WECHSLER. 1945, I believe.

Mr. COHN. The records of the information program show 1944. Do you think those are in error?

Mr. WECHSLER. That may be right. I would not be sure.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you assisted in writing Labor Baron by anybody?

Mr. WECHSLER. No; that was my own.

The CHAIRMAN. And how about Revolt on the Campus?

Mr. WECHSLER. That was my own.

The CHAIRMAN. Pardon me.

Mr. COHN. You say they might be right when their card shows 1944?

Mr. WECHSLER. Yes; that is perfectly possible.

Mr. COHN. Now, I will ask you this, Mr. Wechsler: Were you a Communist when you wrote any of these books—any of these four books?

Mr. WECHSLER. Well, let me say this is all a matter of record, but I will repeat. I was a member of the Young Communist League at the time that I wrote Revolt on the Campus and at the time that I wrote War, Our Heritage. In connection with both the other books, at the time that they were published, I was a vigorous anti-Communist, as the content of the books would demonstrate.

Mr. COHN. You say the content would show that in both cases?

Mr. WECHSLER. No question about it.

Mr. COHN. Now, how about the content in the case of the first two books?

Mr. WECHSLER. Since I have said that at the time I wrote them I was in the Young Communist League, I would hardly contend they were anti-Communist books.

Mr. COHN. Well, did they follow the Communist line?

Mr. WECHSLER. Obviously, yes.



Mr. COHN. They did. Now, when did you join the Young Communist League?

Mr. WECHSLER. In the spring of 1934.

Mr. COHN. Did you join under your own name?

Mr. WECHSLER. No; I did not.

Mr. COHN. Under what name did you join?

Mr. WECHSLER. The name that I used at that time was Arthur Lawson. Let me add that it was a name that I was given when I joined, and that I never used it again. It was not a name that I employed. There was the procedure of using fictitious names when you got your card. That was the name I was given.

Mr. COHN. For how long a period of time were you in the Young Communist League?

Mr. WECHSLER. I left the Young Communist League at the end of 1937. I do not have the exact date. But by the beginning of 1938, when I went to work on the Nation magazine, I had definitely and emphatically severed my connection.

Let me say that these facts are matters that have been inserted in the Congressional Record.

Mr. COHN. They have been inserted in the Congressional Record, you say?

Mr. WECHSLER. Yes, they have. There is a statement which I have with me, if you would care to see it, which I submitted to Senator Lehman at the time when Senator McCarthy made some remarks about me, and the chronology is all in there if you care to look at it.

Senator JACKSON. What is the date of that?

The CHAIRMAN. I may say if you have any material you want to insert in this record, you are at liberty to do so.

Mr. WECHSLER. Yes, sir.

June 9. Yes, the letter was dated June 4, 1952. It appears in the Record as of June 9, 1952. And I would be happy to have it—

Senator JACKSON. June 9, 1952?

Mr. WECHSLER. Yes.

Mr. COHN. When you left the Young Communist League, how did you leave it? Did you send in a formal resignation, or what?

Mr. WECHSLER. Well, as I am sure you know, the process of leaving is never a brief one. When I returned from Europe in the late summer of 1937, I had among other things visited Russia. I had some rather strong feelings about the matter. And by the time I got back, I decided I would not return to work for the American Student Union, which was where I was then working.

I free lanced that autumn, in the process of transition. In, I believe, December, or it could have been November, I officially notified the Young Communist League that I was leaving. I did it in person, and I did it by mail.

Mr. COHN. Whom did you notify in person?

Mr. WECHSLER. Gill Green.

Mr. COHN. Is he one of the leaders of the Communist Party?

Mr. WECHSLER. Yes, he is.

Mr. COHN. Is he a fugitive now?

Mr. WECHSLER. Yes, he is.

Mr. COHN. And you did it by mail?

Mr. WECHSLER. Yes.

Mr. COHN. Do you have a copy?

Mr. WECHSLER. At this moment I do not have. I looked through my records last night, thinking you might ask that question. I have not been able to find a copy. I could summarize the content of it for you, because I have a fairly strong recollection of that period, or at least that point in that period.

The CHAIRMAN. May I interrupt?

You gave the reporter a statement which you want inserted in the record, I believe. You are giving that under oath also, I understand.

Mr. WECHSLER. I am certainly giving this statement under oath. At the time that I submitted it, I volunteered to submit it under oath but was not requested to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of the fact that you are putting this in the record, is it your sworn testimony that the material in that is true?

Mr. WECHSLER. It is, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be received.

(The material referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 15" and will be found in the appendix on p. 282.)

Mr. COHN. Then, Mr. Wechsler, is it fair to say that your testimony is that you broke with the Communist movement in 1937?

Mr. WECHSLER. Yes, at the latter part of 1937.

Mr. COHN. And that was after 2 of these books had been written, and before the last 2 had been written?

Mr. WECHSLER. Exactly.

Mr. COHN. Now, did you go to the FBI, after you broke with the movement, in 1937?

Mr. WECHSLER. No, I did not go to the FBI, but over a period of years—and I couldn't tell you the exact date—I assume the FBI files would show it, in one way or another—I was visited at times by FBI men. I was visited by representatives of other intelligence agencies.

Mr. COHN. Did you ever voluntarily go to the FBI after you broke with the party in 1937?

Mr. WECHSLER. I voluntarily went to the FBI in connection with another matter, in, I think, 1948. I am uncertain of the date. In roughly that period.

The CHAIRMAN. May I interrupt, Mr. Cohn?

Mr. Wechsler, do you have any other people who are members of the Young Communist League, who were or are members of the Young Communist League, working for you on your newspaper?

Mr. WECHSLER. Well, Senator, I will say that I am going to answer that question, because I believe that it is a citizen's responsibility to testify before a Senate committee whether he likes the committee or not.

The CHAIRMAN. I know you do not like this committee.

Mr. WECHSLER. I want to say that I think you are now exploring a subject which the American Society of Newspaper Editors might want to consider at some length.

I answer the question solely because I recognize your capacity for misstatement or misinterpretation of a failure to answer. I answer it with the protest signified.

To my knowledge, there are no Communists on the staff of the New York Post at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question was: Do you have anyone working on the New York Post who is or was a member of the Young Communist League or of the Communist Party?

Mr. WECHSLER. Oh, I believe that there are. I couldn't give you the number. I believe that there are former members of the Young Communist League on the New York Post. I know 1 or 2, and I might add—no; let me say I do not know of 2. I know of one. Mr. Cohn knows of him, too. He is a man named Kempton. And I should like to say that he would be very glad to discuss his position the same as I am discussing mine here. He is the only one, to my knowledge, who was a member of the Young Communist League.

Mr. COHN. Is he an author of any books?

Mr. WECHSLER. Not to my knowledge.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we should have the record clear, whether Mr. Wechsler objects to our asking him questions as to whether he has Communists working on his paper or members of the Young Communist League. We consider that rather important.

You see, your books—some of them—were paid for by taxpayers' money. They are being used allegedly to fight communism. Your record, as far as I can see it, has not been to fight communism. You have fought every man who has ever tried to fight communism, as far as I know. Your paper, in my opinion, is next to and almost paralleling the Daily Worker. We are curious to know, therefore, why your books were purchased. We want to know how many Communists, if any, you still have working with you.

You say you believe that the only individual you have working for you at this time who either is or was a member of the Young Communist League, or who is or was a member of the Communist Party, is Murray Kempton. Is that right?

Mr. WECHSLER. Yes; and I said "was" very emphatically, and let me add equally emphatically that Mr. Kempton has for many years been publicly and on the record a rather vigorous anti-Communist.

The CHAIRMAN. How about Robert Bendiner?

Mr. WECHSLER. Mr. Bendiner is not a member of the staff, Senator. He is a contributor of a weekly column. It is my understanding that he was an editor of the New Masses, and I would assume that in that capacity—that was 17 years ago—at the time he was on the New Masses, which was for a period of 6 months, he was a Communist. Let me add again that Mr. Benliner is a vigorous, emphatic anti-Communist.

And I wonder if, in view of your remarks, I would be permitted to insert in the record a couple of documents, including the draft resolution of the Communist Party of December 28, 1952, in which the Communist Party's national committee proclaims that the failure of the Communist Progressive Party campaign in the last election was due to the policies of the Reuthers, Dubinskys, Wechslers, et al.—

who paralyzed independent political action by projecting the myth that Stevenson was an obstacle to the path of reaction.

The statement as published on page 4 of the Worker for Sunday, December 28, 1952, reads in part:

Support of the prowar measures of the Truman administration; acceptance and propagation of the "big lie" of the external and internal "Communist menace" disarmed the workers, blocked the path to independent action by labor and its allies, and paved the way for a Republican victory.

The major responsibility for this policy and its consequences rests squarely with the reformist and Social Democratic trade-union officialdom. This was the content of the policies of the Reuthers, Dubinskys, Wechslers, et al., who para-

lyzed independent political action by projecting the myth that Stevenson was an obstacle to the advance of reaction. They pursued these policies despite the fact that the Democratic Party administration, operating with bipartisan support, originated and unfolded the current war program in behalf of Wall Street.

I am rather fond of this tribute, and it may perhaps have some bearing on your comment that I have not been active in fighting communism.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have anything to do with the passage of that resolution? Did you take any part in promoting the passage of that resolution?

Mr. WECHSLER. Is this a serious question?

The CHAIRMAN. Will you read the question to the witness?  
(Record read by reporter.)

Mr. WECHSLER. Sir, I have not been in any way affiliated with the Communist movement since late 1937, as I believe your investigation will show. That resolution was adopted by the Communist Party as a tribute to the militant and vigorous anticommunism of the New York Post, which has, in my judgment, been more effective in leading people away from communism, Senator, than those who prefer to identify liberalism with communism.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, will you answer the question.

Mr. WECHSLER. The answer is "No," Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. The answer is "No." Do you know whether anyone on your staff took any part in promoting the passage of that resolution?

Mr. WECHSLER. Senator, to the best of my knowledge, no one on my staff is a member of the central committee of the Communist Party or identified with it in any way.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, will you answer the question? Will you read the question to the witness?

Mr. WECHSLER. I have answered it as best I can.

The CHAIRMAN. You have said that you did not think anyone on your staff was a part of the central committee. That was not the question.

Read the question to the witness.

(Record read by reporter.)

Mr. WECHSLER. I do not know that anyone on my staff took any part in promoting the passage of that resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. I previously asked you whether anyone working for you is or was a member of the Communist Party or the Young Communist League. Apparently you understand that to mean only those who work full time.

We will now ask that question in relation to those that are contributing material, either in the way of columns or otherwise, to your paper.

Mr. WECHSLER. I believe that, with the addition of Bendiner's name, I have answered it. You have not raised the question I would consider relevant, as to whether there were at that time any members of the staff that were what you would call followers of the Communist line.

I believe in that connection there is one other member of the staff who would fall into that category.

Let me say for him as I said for Kempton that he would take the position that regardless of his feelings about your committee he is prepared to testify fully and freely.

The CHAIRMAN. We do not care whether he is prepared to testify or not. If the evidence is relevant, we subpoena the witnesses. You are not here voluntarily.

Mr. WECHSLER. I beg to differ, Senator. I am here voluntarily. I have not been subpoenaed.

Mr. COHN. The witness was requested by telephone to appear, which under Senate rules is an order to appear, under penalty for failure to comply.

The CHAIRMAN. How about Joe Lash?

Mr. WECHSLER. Joe Lash is the man to whom I was referring.

The CHAIRMAN. You say he was a follower of the Communist line in your opinion?

Mr. WECHSLER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And you think he has broken away and is now an anti-Communist?

Mr. WECHSLER. In 1939, Mr. Lash led the fight in the American Youth Congress to take away from the Communists the leadership of that organization, as I believe Mr. Rushmore can testify. In the ensuing 14 years Mr. Lash has been, in my judgment, a consistent and effective anti-Communist.

The CHAIRMAN. How about James Casey?

Mr. WECHSLER. I add him to the list. Obviously, Casey is not a writer on the staff, but a member of the copy desk. Mr. Casey is well known as a former managing editor of the Daily Worker. I believe he left the Communist Party in 1935. I believe the record should also show that he has been for many years a member of the Social Democratic Federation, which is one of the most bitterly anti-Communist organizations in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, now that I have refreshed your recollection, we are getting some more names. Aside from those names that I gave you, is there anyone else connected either full time or part time with your paper, either on the copy desk, or writing a column, anything for your paper, who is or was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WECHSLER. Senator, may I ask at this point whether this is an investigation of me, or the New York Post?

The CHAIRMAN. It is checking the type of individuals whose books are being purchased to fight communism, allegedly.

Mr. WECHSLER. I understand that.

The CHAIRMAN. And we are going into your background for that purpose. If you are hiring Communists—

Mr. WECHSLER. I ask you for that reason. I didn't hire James Casey. That is why I asked you the question. And I believe that under the existing union rules under which I, as an editor, operate, even if Mr. Casey were not an anti-Communist, I would not have been in a position to dispense with his services, except for an active infringement.

Senator JACKSON. Is Mr. Casey a Communist now?

Mr. WECHSLER. Mr. Casey, as I am glad to say, Senator—I believe he ceased being managing editor of the Daily Worker about 4 years before Mr. Rushmore left the Daily Worker, and he has subse-

quently been an active, aggressive anti-Communist member of the Social Democratic Federation, which—I can only put it this way—was the right wing of the Socialist Party. It included such men at one time as Louis Waldman.

Senator JACKSON. So I take it your testimony is that Mr. Casey, since he has been working on the Post, has not been a Communist?

Mr. WECHSLER. Certainly since he has been working for me, sir, which is 4 years; and to the best of my knowledge for many years before that.

Senator JACKSON. What about Mr. Lash? What are his functions on the paper? Does he participate in a policy way?

Mr. WECHSLER. No; he is the United Nations correspondent.

I might say that Mr. Lash, if he were here, could submit, as I hope to be able to do, any number of published documents in which his anticommunism is clear.

Senator JACKSON. He is not now a Communist?

Mr. WECHSLER. To the best of my knowledge, he was never in the formal sense a Communist. I think that Joe would testify, and I think he would urge me to testify, that for a period in the thirties he was a follower of the Communist line.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you been making attacks upon J. Edgar Hoover in the editorial columns of your paper?

Mr. WECHSLER. Sir, the New York Post has, on a couple of occasions, carried editorials critical of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. We do not regard any Government agency as above criticism. I assume your committee doesn't either. We have at the same time taken very strongly the position that the charge that the FBI is a Gestapo or a Fascist agency was an unfounded, unwarranted charge.

I might say to you, for whatever whimsical quality we can have in this hearing, that at the time I became editor of the New York Post—I regret I do not have it with me, but I will be glad to submit it for the record, because I know I have it in my files—I received a letter of congratulations from Mr. Lou Nichols, who I believe is now the deputy to Mr. J. Edgar Hoover. I shall be happy to submit that letter for the files.

Let me add, in Mr. Nichols' behalf, that at the time we criticized the FBI, he took issue with me. We have had some lively correspondence. But I would still choose to regard him as a friend.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever, in your editorial columns, over the last 2 years, praised the FBI?

Mr. WECHSLER. Well, sir, I would have to go back and read our editorials for the last 2 years. I did not understand that I was being called down here for a discussion of Post editorial policy. I have tried to say to you what we have said editorially about the FBI.

The CHAIRMAN. Is your answer that you do not recall at this time any praise of the FBI, but you do recall editorializing against the FBI?

Mr. WECHSLER. The statement that I made was not a criticism of the FBI. The statement I made was an attitude toward the FBI, which was that it was an agency that did not deserve to be above criticism, but that neither was it an agency which deserved to be denounced as it has been denounced in some quarters as a Fascist-Gestapo agency, and so on.

That is my attitude toward the FBI.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you always been very critical of the heads of the Un-American Activities Committee? You have always thought they were pretty bad men, have you not?

Mr. WECHSLER. Well, you would have to tell me whom we were talking about. For example, I have here, and I think that perhaps it would be a good thing to submit it for the record—

The CHAIRMAN. You may submit anything you care to for the record.

Mr. WECHSLER. A letter from then Congressman Nixon, who was very active, as I understand it, in the House Un-American Activities Committee exposure of Alger Hiss, in which he warmly praised an editorial that I wrote on the Hiss case. I have it here. I would like to submit that.

The CHAIRMAN. You may put that in.

(Editorial of the New York Post for January 23, 1950, was marked "Exhibit No. 16" and will be found in the appendix on p. 283. Letter from the then Congressman Nixon, dated January 30, 1950, was marked "Exhibit No. 17" and will be found in the appendix on p. 285.)

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to have you get back to my question, then, if you could, however.

Mr. WECHSLER. Well, he was a member, as you will recall, at that time, of the House Un-American Activities Committee, and I am saying only that in connection with the Hiss case, I certainly did not take a critical position about the committee. I think I was one of the first writers in a magazine article to suggest great doubt about Alger Hiss' protestations of innocence. And if I may read here the note from Congressman Nixon, under date of January 30, 1950, it reads as follows.

The CHAIRMAN. I am going to let you read anything you want to into the record, but first I want you to answer the question, if you will.

Have you consistently criticized the chairmen of the House Un-American Activities Committee, whose task it is to expose Communists, or have you ever found one of them that you thought was a pretty good fellow, that you praised, or that you could praise as of today—a chairman?

Mr. WECHSLER. Well, if you are asking me my position on the activities of the Velde committee, my answer is that I have been editorially critical of those activities, as have many other newspapers.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you understand the question?

Mr. WECHSLER. Yes. I thought—

The CHAIRMAN. I asked you whether you consistently criticized at all times the various heads of the Un-American Activities Committee. Have you ever in the past or can you now think of a single chairman of one of those committees who, in your opinion, was a good man and did a good job?

Mr. WECHSLER. I don't remember whether Congressman Nixon was chairman at the time of the Hiss case. I guess he was not. He was a minority member.

The CHAIRMAN. He was not the chairman.

Mr. WECHSLER. So I think the answer, Senator, would be that I do not recall praising a chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Mr. COHN. Had you praised Congressman Nixon in the editorial?

Mr. WECHSLER. Well, I believe that in my—

The CHAIRMAN. Have you got the editorial?

Mr. WECHSLER. Yes; I have it here. I would be glad to submit it.

No; I did not. But I believe that his letter was an outgrowth of my earlier article in the Progressive. In any case——

Mr. COHN. I want to ask you this one thing before I forget.

Mr. WECHSLER. Anyway, if it is a momentous issue, Senator, I am unable to present any documents suggesting that I praised a chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The principal villains in your book are those in the Congress who have gone about the job of exposing Communists. Is that correct? Or is that an unfair statement?

Mr. WECHSLER. No, Senator; that is not correct. If I may, since you have asked the question, we have repeatedly taken the position that the New York Post is as bitterly opposed to Joe Stalin as it is to Joe McCarthy, and we believe that a free society can combat both.

The CHAIRMAN. And you are opposed to Bill Jenner, too. You think he is a dangerous man?

Mr. WECHSLER. Senator, I give you a priority in this field, and I have not written about Senator Jenner in recent months, because, for example, with respect to the activities of the Senator's committee, I have not criticized the work of its committee counsel, Mr. Robert Morris.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think Jenner is doing a good job?

Mr. WECHSLER. Senator, I assume you do not want me to make speeches here, and I am trying not to. However, when you ask me a question like that, it is difficult not to respond with a speech.

The CHAIRMAN. You can answer that in as great length as you care to. We have a lot of time.

Mr. WECHSLER. My basic position is that American society is a very strong and resilient one. I believe that we have successfully resisted Communist aggression in the world under the leadership of men whom you have at times deemed sinister. I believe that in the battle of ideas we can compete effectively any day of the week with the Communists without resorting to methods which I regard as imitative of theirs. I see by your expression that you feel as if you have heard this before, so I will not pursue the point.

The CHAIRMAN. I have. I have read it in the Daily Worker and in the New York Post.

Mr. WECHSLER. You have probably read it in the New York Times. I can't help but wonder when the editor of the Times is going to be down here.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think he has written any books for the information program, and if our evidence shows he did and was a member of the Communist Party or the Young Communist League and if since then he has been consistently fighting anyone who fights communism, we would bring him down.

Mr. WECHSLER. Senator, I have not been consistently fighting anyone who fights communism. That is not a true statement. I have been fighting communism for many years. And I say to you that when you suggest that I drafted the Communist resolution denouncing me, you are attempting to prove a point which you know can't be proved. And while we are on the point, let me add this is not a new discovery of mine.



The CHAIRMAN. Will you get back to that question after a while?

The question is: Do you think Bill Jenner is doing a good job?

Mr. WECHSLER. I am not an enthusiast of Senator Jenner's.

The CHAIRMAN. How about Velde? You are opposed to him, are you not?

Mr. WECHSLER. I believe that in recent weeks Congressman Velde has been making an effort to improve the procedures of congressional investigations, and I eagerly await the outcome.

The CHAIRMAN. You have been critical of Velde in your column?

Mr. WECHSLER. I couldn't say at this moment we have devoted any column to him, but I would have to check that.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you know Harry Dexter White?

Mr. WECHSLER. I saw Harry Dexter White once in my life. That was when I returned from Germany, after I had been separated from the Treasury Department, and it was at his office that I received the papers of separation.

The CHAIRMAN. You had not seen him before then?

Mr. WECHSLER. I have never, to my knowledge, even seen him before that.

The CHAIRMAN. You were in the Army for a while?

Mr. WECHSLER. I was what?

The CHAIRMAN. You were in the Army for a while?

Mr. WECHSLER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you enter?

Mr. WECHSLER. In April 1945.

The CHAIRMAN. And then when did you leave?

Mr. WECHSLER. I will have to give you a narrative again.

The CHAIRMAN. Roughly.

Mr. WECHSLER. As an enlisted man, I was sent to Germany in the summer of 1945, to work in military government. At that time, along with many others, as was the process in the Army then, I was, as it was called, civilianized and attached to military government. I believe my separation occurred in October.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you separated upon the request of Harry Dexter White?

Mr. WECHSLER. Not to my knowledge. I was separated, to my knowledge, at the request of Colonel Bernstein.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever heard that Harry Dexter White signed the order or the request that you be, as you say, "civilianized"?

Mr. WECHSLER. I have never heard that, but I repeat again: I was in a division of military government which was under the jurisdiction of the Treasury. My superior was Colonel Bernstein. I was an enlisted man, a GI. I would not have been told who signed what papers. I was assigned to Colonel Bernstein actually as press agent.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any doubt in your mind that Harry Dexter White at that time was a Communist agent?

Mr. WECHSLER. Senator, I haven't any personal knowledge of Harry Dexter White. If you are asking me my opinions based on hearsay and reading, that is quite a different matter; but I must confess that I hesitate to pronounce a certain answer about a dead man.

Senator JACKSON. Did you ever talk to him, have any dealings with him?

Mr. WECHSLER. Literally once, which was a conversation lasting 2 minutes, in which I went into his office and got my final severance from the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you this: First, is it correct, Mr. Cohn, that Harry Dexter White signed the order referred to?

Mr. COHN. That is my information, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. After that order had been signed, is it correct that you were working under a Mr. Russ Nixon, a man known to you then as a member of the Communist Party? This was in 1945.

Mr. WECHSLER. Senator, let me make clear for your benefit—I assume you are reading from a deposition in another matter. I was a GI in the army assigned to Germany. I was assigned to Colonel Bernstein. Colonel Bernstein resigned. General Clay appointed Russ Nixon as his successor. I simply was held over for a brief period in the job which I had held before, which was that of press agent for the man in charge of the division.

With respect to the condition of military government in Germany at that time, I could only say that I think General Clay would be a far more informed witness than I. But I was not in a position of choice as to working for Russ Nixon.

I might add that I don't know that he was in a position of choice about keeping me there. We were not friends.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you working under Russ Nixon?

Mr. WECHSLER. Yes, sir. Under the circumstances I have just described.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you know he was a Communist at that time?

Mr. WECHSLER. I had every reason to believe—I regarded him as a Communist, without knowing whether he held a party card or not.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether Harry Dexter White placed him in that job?

Mr. WECHSLER. I don't know, sir. All that I knew about Nixon was that, when Bernstein left, General Clay appointed Nixon as Bernstein's successor.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever report to the FBI that you considered Nixon a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WECHSLER. Senator, the Nixon battle was a battle of the ETO. There was no secret about it. It was fought from Berlin to Frankfurt. And it was won, I am glad to say, within a couple of months after I was assigned to work for him. It was a battle well known. I discussed it many times with newspapermen there. Russ Nixon was not a secret figure. Russ Nixon was one of the active members of the left wing of the CIO. I would have hardly felt it necessary to tell the FBI that Russ Nixon had Communist sympathies. That was fairly apparent.

The CHAIRMAN. Your testimony, then, is that you felt it was so generally known that he was a Communist that it was unnecessary for you to add your voice to that.

Mr. WECHSLER. Oh, I think I may have helped speed his day of departure by discussing it with newspapermen who were interested in the story.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you consider John P. Lewis a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WECHSLER. John P. Lewis?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. WECHSLER. Definitely not, sir.

Senator JACKSON. Who is John P. Lewis?

Mr. WECHSLER. He was the managing editor of PM at the time I worked there.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, I asked you a question before, and we got away from it. The question was: Aside from the four people you named, do you now know of anyone else who was working for you or your paper in any capacity; either as a copy boy, an editorial writer, a weekly or monthly contributor, who either was or is a member of the Young Communist League or the Communist Party?

Mr. WECHSLER. Offhand, I do not recall any. I would have to go through a staff list to give you a definitive answer.

I might say on this point, Senator: You see, my problem was somewhat solved for me, because when I became editor of the Post I succeeded Ted Thackrey. Ted Thackrey set up a newspaper called the Compass, which in my judgment was a newspaper that followed the Communist line. I would say that, at the time he did that, the few Communist activists on the New York Post went over to him, and I have not had a Communist problem on the New York Post, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you feel, when you took over, the Communists voluntarily left and went over to Thackrey on the Compass?

Mr. WECHSLER. Yes, sir; to the degree that there was any Communist infiltration of the Post.

Let me add: I haven't the faintest notion what the political affiliations are of the men who set the type on the Post. If I discovered that anti-Communist editorials were coming out wrong every day, there would be an investigation. We haven't had that problem.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever give the FBI a list of the people who were with you in the Young Communist League?

Mr. WECHSLER. I gave the FBI a statement, I believe, in the year 1948. I will have to bore you again, I am afraid. In that year, my wife was then employed by the President's Committee on Civil Rights. She was an attorney.

The CHAIRMAN. Incidentally, let me interrupt. Was your wife a member of the Young Communist League also?

Mr. WECHSLER. At the time that I was, and I believe that we were fortunate enough to grow up politically simultaneously, so I think that she may have even left a couple of months before I did.

The CHAIRMAN. Your position is that both you and your wife are now anti-Communist?

Mr. WECHSLER. Emphatically and strongly.

The CHAIRMAN. And if you knew of any Communists in Government, you would identify them to the correct Government agency?

Mr. WECHSLER. Senator, I said that I have been interviewed by FBI agents on numerous occasions and asked about men in Government, and I have given truthful responses to the best of my ability on every occasion. I have always made clear on these occasions that I left this organization late in 1937, and that any direct knowledge I would have would end with that date.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever give the FBI a list of your fellow members of the Young Communist League?

Mr. WECHSLER. I believe, sir, and this would be available, and it is not a secret document, that when I went to see Mr. Nichols in 1948, which was what I started to tell you, at a time when my wife was under attack, and we discovered that there were a couple of errors in the FBI dossier, they were not up to date, and Mr. Nichols was extremely cooperative about bringing them up to date. I made a statement to him at that time, and I told him then of my history in the Young Communist League, and I told him of the youth group with which I was affiliated, a group which was drawn from all the youth organizations, the leaders of the youth organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you give him a list of the names?

Mr. WECHSLER. To the best of my knowledge, I did, sir. To the best of my recollection. I remember clearly discussing names with him.

I might add, on that point—

The CHAIRMAN. Roughly, how many names did you give him?

Mr. WECHSLER. Oh, I would say half a dozen. You see, let me make one point clear. At the time I was in the Young Communist League, I did not have any contact with any large group of underground Communists. Most of the Communists of that day were known Communists. There was no political underground with which I was associated. I can only say, on this general point, and say it quite emphatically, that any knowledge that I have that would be useful to this Government in protecting its national security has always been available and has been given to the Government on any occasion when the situation arose.

The CHAIRMAN. You say you think you gave the FBI a list of about six of your fellow members of the Young Communist League?

Mr. WECHSLER. I want to make one point clear, Senator: That in the discussion in the statement that I gave Mr. Nichols, as I recall it, I described what was the group in which all the leaders of various youth organizations assembled. I do not know that every one of those leaders held a card in the YCL or the Communist Party. I do not believe that anyone who was in that group could truthfully deny that we were operating under Communist discipline and that it was a Communist group. It was not the usual Communist unit. That is the only distinction I am drawing.

The CHAIRMAN. And the question is: How many names did you give the FBI?

Mr. WECHSLER. As I said, I think it is about half a dozen, but I would have to refresh my recollection with the statement that I gave the FBI.

The CHAIRMAN. You are sure you gave them a list of names?

Mr. WECHSLER. I am sure that I mentioned names. I haven't any question about that.

The CHAIRMAN. And was that in a written statement?

Mr. WECHSLER. It was in a statement that was dictated in Mr. Nichols' office.

The CHAIRMAN. And you are sure that in that dictated statement you mentioned the names of some of those who were with you in this Young Communist League?

Mr. WECHSLER. That is my best recollection, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. But you are not sure of that?

Mr. WECHSLER. I can remember discussing names with Mr. Nichols. We would have to check the statement to see whether the names were in the statement or whether I gave them verbally and he took them down.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the only time that you ever gave the FBI the names of fellow young Communist Leaguers?

Mr. WECHSLER. Let me make one point clear about this, Senator. The Young Communist Leaguers whom I knew were known, were mostly known, Communists. This was not an underground operation in that sense. Where I have been asked about people that I knew at any time, I answered fully and freely to the best of my ability. If I knew today that someone who was in the Young Communist League with me was in a strategic Government post, I would certainly communicate that information. There has never been any question in my mind as to a citizen's responsibility on that point. I have never been uncooperative in the discussion of such cases.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know now the names of any of those who were with you in the Young Communist League, or have you forgotten them? Do you know the names now of any of those fellow Young Communist Leaguers?

Mr. WECHSLER. Sure. Do you want a long list? A short list? How do you want this?

The CHAIRMAN. I think all of those that you can think of.

Mr. WECHSLER. Joe Cadden was a Communist at that time. Bill Hinckley was, to the best of my knowledge, a Communist. And here I would draw only what to me is a legal but not a moral distinction as to whether he held a card. Celeste Strack was, of course, an active Communist in that period. Bert Witt, who subsequently became an active Wallace Leaguer on the west coast. I once tried to explain this to Mr. Wallace. I thought it might do some good there. Kenneth Born, who was another Wallacite in 1948.

I would say those were the major characters.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know any of those Young Communists who are in any Government position as of today?

Mr. WECHSLER. No, sir; I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know Bernard DeVoto?

Mr. WECHSLER. I trust this is not a sequitur.

The CHAIRMAN. Pardon?

Mr. WECHSLER. I trust this is not a sequitur.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a question.

Mr. WECHSLER. I believe I may have met Bernard DeVoto. I can't recall the occasion on which I did. If I did, it would have been up at Harvard on some occasion when I met him. I regret to say he is not a close personal friend of mine.

The CHAIRMAN. You regret to say that?

Mr. WECHSLER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You did not collaborate with him in writing the article in which he advocated that Americans not talk to the FBI?

Mr. WECHSLER. No, sir; I thought that was a very bad article.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not agree with that?

Mr. WECHSLER. I don't agree with that.

The CHAIRMAN. Just one other question. We are going to ask you, Mr. Wechsler, to prepare a list and submit to the committee and consider it to be submitted under oath, of all of the Young Communist

Leaguers that you knew as such, or the Communists. That is an order.

Senator Jackson, do you have any questions?

Mr. WECHSLER. I would just like to say, on that point, Senator, that I am here as a responsive but not a friendly witness.

I would like to add the obvious point at this moment that I have severed my association with the Communists as of nearly 16 years ago.

I trust that you will recognize that the list I give you would be as complete as a man's memory might be. I don't know that you would be able to do very well with a similar list of any organization that you were connected with 16 years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we are asking for the list. You say you have severed your connection. I am not going to, at this time, try to—

Mr. WECHSLER. Senator, you are raising that point.

The CHAIRMAN (continuing). Pass on whether that is true or not. I know that you have never testified in a case against a Communist. I know that none of the men that you have named here as anti-Communists have ever testified in a case against Communists. I know that they and you have been consistently and viciously attacking anyone who does testify against Communists, anyone that exposes Communists—

Mr. WECHSLER. Senator, that is not true.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me finish. You may have all the time in the world to talk.

So you cannot blame the average person who questions whether you ever did break with the party.

Mr. WECHSLER. Oh, I can, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You cannot question our right to check and see why your books are being put on the shelves allegedly to fight communism. Certainly no one who is anti-Communist would put the New York Post on a shelf to fight communism any more than they would use the Daily Worker. Now you can speak at length, if you care to.

Mr. WECHSLER. Senator, first of all, I would like to enter into the record, a chapter from a book called Labor Baron, which is called Lewis and the Communists. This book was written—we have the date here—it was April 1944, that I finished the book. I think that there are 30 pages here as of 8 years ago, which give a fairly definitive description of my attitude toward the Communists.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you not suggest that if we were receiving one chapter we should receive the entire book?

Mr. WECHSLER. Oh, certainly. I was trying to save the committee some money.

The CHAIRMAN. We will receive the entire book as an exhibit.

(The book Labor Baron was marked "Exhibit No. 18" and may be found in the files of the subcommittee.)

Senator JACKSON. Mr. Wechsler, how old were you when you joined the Young Communist League?

Mr. WECHSLER. I was 18 years old.

Senator JACKSON. How old were you when you left?

Mr. WECHSLER. I joined in April 1934. I was going to be 19 in October. I left in 1937, when I would have been 22 years old. These dates don't quite match, because they are different seasons of the year that we are talking about. But I had just turned 22 when I left.

Senator JACKSON. You were between 18 and 19 when you joined, and you were just turned 22 when you left the Communist Party. That was in 1937?

Mr. WECHSLER. That is correct, sir.

Senator JACKSON. What did you do after that? Were you in college in 1937?

Mr. WECHSLER. No, sir. I graduated from college in June of 1935.

Senator JACKSON. How old were you when you graduated?

Mr. WECHSLER. I was then going on 20.

Senator JACKSON. What school did you graduate from?

Mr. WECHSLER. Columbia University.

Senator JACKSON. You were with the Young Communist League, I take it, after you got out of college in 1935, or were active in it?

Mr. WECHSLER. Yes, sir, after I got out of college I wrote *Revolt on the Campus*. Then, in December of 1935, the American Student Union was formed, and I went to work for it as director of publications, which meant that I edited the magazine which they put out. And I continued to work there until the summer of 1937.

Senator JACKSON. Then what did you do?

Mr. WECHSLER. In the fall of 1937, when my wife and I came back from this European trip, which included a trip to Russia, I was a free-lance writer for about 3 months. I wrote articles for the *Nation*, for the *Times* magazine, and a couple of others.

Senator JACKSON. The *New York Times*?

Mr. WECHSLER. Yes. And in January, I believe, of 1938, January or February, I went to work as a full-time editor on the *Nation*.

I might add that at the time I went to work for the *Nation* it was a vigorously anti-Communist magazine which was at that time—

The CHAIRMAN. I did not get the name of this vigorously anti-Communist magazine you mentioned.

Mr. WECHSLER. Pardon me, sir?

The CHAIRMAN. You referred to a magazine as being vigorously anti-Communist. What was the name of that magazine?

Mr. WECHSLER. The name of it was the *Nation*.

The CHAIRMAN. Pardon me.

Senator JACKSON. What was your position with reference to the Russian-Nazi Pact of 1939?

Mr. WECHSLER. Let me say that prior to that pact I was anti-Communist, but my position on the pact was one of bitter denunciation, and I regret that I could not find this last night, but I would like to insert in the record—I wrote an article, a signed article, in the *Nation* at that time called *Stalin and Union Square*, which was a discussion of the terrible impact of this agreement on the world.

Senator JACKSON. Will you supply a copy of that to the committee?

Mr. WECHSLER. I certainly will, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did I understand you to say you thought the *Nation* was anti-Communist?

Mr. WECHSLER. I said at that time, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. At that time, but not as of today?

Mr. WECHSLER. I would not make the same comment at this time.

Senator JACKSON. That was 1938 you were referring to, as to the *Nation*?

Mr. WECHSLER. Yes, sir; I worked on the Nation from 1938, from January 1938, until I believe May of 1940, when the newspaper, PM, was formed.

Senator JACKSON. Well, now, would you supply for the committee any articles that you might have written at or about the time of the Nazi pact?

Mr. WECHSLER. I will certainly do that, sir.

Senator JACKSON. And up until the invasion of Russia by the Nazis in June of 1951, I mean, about your position during that period.

Mr. WECHSLER. Yes. Because you see, in May of 1940, I went to work on PM as an assistant labor editor. So that I don't know how many byline pieces I would have. I might add on that point, however, that I was at that time extremely active in the anti-Communist wing of the American Newspaper Guild, and in New York City, we licked the Communists, as Mr. Rushmore may mention. He might even testify to this point some day. We not only licked them, but took it over from them. I regard that as a part of my anti-Communist record, going quite a distance back, if I may say so.

Senator JACKSON. Well, to continue on, can you supply for the committee, in addition to these articles that you have referred to and testified to, and your book, such information as you might have available from the time you left the Communist Party up to the present time, outlining your position for the purpose of the record, in view of the testimony here?

Mr. WECHSLER. Senator, I hate to be putting all my books in the record. It costs a lot of money.

Senator JACKSON. No, they are exhibits.

Mr. WECHSLER. But the book, War Propaganda and the United States, which was published in 1940, during the Nazi-Soviet Pact, includes a lengthy chapter dealing critically with and exposing Communist propaganda at that time.

Senator JACKSON. I think that ought to be included as an exhibit, the whole book.

Mr. WECHSLER. I hate to act like a book salesman.

Senator JACKSON. Well, you are giving them away.

(The book, War Propaganda and the United States, was marked "Exhibit No. 19" and may be found in the files of the subcommittee.)

Mr. WECHSLER. Let me add on this point again——

Senator JACKSON. Let me just ask you this one question. Since you left the Communist Party, after you came back from Europe in 1937——

Mr. WECHSLER. The Young Communist League.

Senator JACKSON. Well, the Young Communist League.

Mr. WECHSLER. Youth was the only saving grace.

Senator JACKSON. As I take it, your position publicly and in written articles has been on an anti-Communist basis, and on basic Communist issues you have been anti-Communist, including such matters as the Nazi pact and action taken by the Soviet after World War II?

Mr. WECHSLER. Yes, sir. There is no question about it.

Senator JACKSON. What was your position on Greek-Turkish aid? Did you have anything on that?

Mr. WECHSLER. Well, sir, I have got to go back a bit on this, because the more you talk the more I realize the number of exhibits I should have brought.



I became editor of the Post in May 1949. At that time one of the great issues which the Communists were fighting in America was the Marshall plan. I was a vigorous supporter editorially of the Marshall plan. I was a vigorous supporter of the Truman doctrine. This is editorially; these are matters that are on the record. I would be happy to submit to this committee every editorial written since I became editor.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think that I would care to read them.

Mr. WECHSLER. Well, sir, you have made rather strong judgments about me. I would think perhaps in fairness you ought to read them someday.

The CHAIRMAN. I read enough of your stuff, Mr. Wechsler, to find that your paper, as far as I know, always leads the vanguard, with the Daily Worker, follows the same line, against anyone who is willing to expose Communists in Government. That may be your way of fighting communism. Now, you have a perfect right to. People have a right to buy the sheet.

I do not care to read any more of it myself.

I want to thank you for the invitation, however.

Mr. WECHSLER. Senator, perhaps in line with your questioning, Senator Jackson, I should also enter at this point an article from the New York Times, June 15, 1946, headlined "Five Quit PM Saying Reds Sway Editor." That was a reference to the then editor of PM, Ralph Ingersoll. I was the head of the Washington Bureau of PM at that time. I resigned along with four of my colleagues, the late Nate Robertson, and others, and in the course of the statement we said as follows:

Although not himself a Communist, he has continuously yielded to Communist pressure and has denounced as factionists those staff members who have tried to keep the party line out of the paper.

He has destroyed the confidence of those who believe that PM should be as realistic and critical in its coverage and examination of Russian foreign policy as in its evaluation of the foreign policy of our own Government.

I would like to submit this for the record. This is a climax of a bitter internal battle in PM in which I, if I may say so with humility, was a leader of the anti-Communist bloc on the newspaper. I would like to submit that.

I would also like to enter in the record an article from the Daily Worker dated December 22, 1942, which is an attack largely devoted to me. It refers to me in the following terms:

Then there is the case of James W. Wechsler, an ex-Communist who, in his work in PM's Washington Bureau, displays the typical jitters of an "ex" since he is never quite sure that the Dies committee or the influential people he wants to impress will accept his conversion at its face value.

You see, I had trouble convincing them.

The CHAIRMAN. I assume you will have trouble convincing anyone if you follow the same line you do in your paper, but that is your business.

Mr. WECHSLER (reading):

Wechsler suffers especially since the Dies committee launched the cry that some "Communists" announce their desertion of "communism" only the better to propagate their "communism." (In this view, even the abolition of polltax is described as "communism.")

Such chronic suspicion of "ex-Communist" is, of course, an occupational hazard of that tribe which would have only a private clinical interest, were it not for

the fact that Wechsler, apparently, is a determining voice in PM's political policies.

Then it goes on to denounce me at great length and ends by saying that:

It is due to Wechsler's influence that PM, alone of all the New York newspapers, suppressed from its news report Premier Sikorski's warning: "The Germans will try to frighten the democracies by the threat of Bolshevism. \* \* \*"

I would like to enter this in the record.

(A newspaper clipping from the New York Times, dated June 14, 1946, was marked "Exhibit No. 20" and will be found in the appendix on p. 285; an excerpt from the Daily Worker of Tuesday, December 22, 1942, was marked "Exhibit No. 21" and will be found in the appendix on p. 287.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wechsler, let me ask you this: If you or I were a member of the Communist Party and we wanted to advance the Communist line, perhaps the most effective way of doing that would be to claim we deserted the party; and if we got in control of the paper, use that paper to attack and smear anybody who actually was fighting communism. Now, without saying whether you have done it, you would agree that would be a good tactic, would you not?

Mr. WECHSLER. Senator, perhaps I have some more knowledge on this than you do. I don't know of cases in which the Communist Party undertook that activity. I would doubt very much that because you have an ex-Communist on your staff that he was an agent of the Communists working within your committee.

The CHAIRMAN. I may say, Mr. Wechsler, there is a big difference between the ex-Communist on our committee and your excommunism, either real or alleged. Mr. Rushmore has testified before a very sizable number of committees. He has cooperated with the FBI. He has given all the information, complete information, on the Communists that he has worked with on the Daily Worker. There is no doubt about his anticommunism and his being a real ex-Communist. He does not spend his time, you see, trying to smear and tear down the people who are really fighting communism.

Mr. WECHSLER. Senator, let's face it. You are saying that an ex-Communist who is for McCarthy is a good one and an ex-Communist who is against McCarthy is suspect. I will stand on that distinction.

The CHAIRMAN. No; that is incorrect. I will say you can judge whether a man is really an ex-Communist quite well by a number of things. No. 1, if you find that he cooperates with the Government agencies which are digging out the Communists, with the committees, gives all the information, not a matter of perhaps giving six names, not knowing whether he gave the names or not—a real ex-Communist does not take it upon himself to fight and smear every real ex-Communist who decides to expose his former fellow Communists. There is a big difference, you see, a huge difference.

Mr. WECHSLER. Senator, I want to comment on this point. I feel rather strongly about it.

The CHAIRMAN. You can, at length.

Mr. WECHSLER. I think ex-Communists, like ex-Democrats, are different kinds of human beings—they are varied; I have different feelings about some than about others—but I feel very strongly about the suggestion that I have invariably smeared ex-Communists who were doing what you consider to be patriotic work. At the time when

Whittaker Chambers was the key witness in the trial of Alger Hiss, it was quite fashionable in some places, Republican and Democratic circles alike, let me add, to say that obviously Alger Hiss must be innocent because he is such a fine fellow, and Whittaker Chambers is an ex-Communist. And I repeat again, and I shall submit this along with other articles, that I think I was one of the first people to write a detailed study of the Hiss case which suggested rather strongly that Mr. Chambers might be telling the truth. I have never attacked Whittaker Chambers. I happen to have a great respect for him as a writer. I disagree with him politically. I regret that he chose to be a Republican, but this is a free country. I am sure that he would forgive my having supported Adlai Stevenson. But I do not want the record to show in any way that I participated in what was in my judgment a smear campaign against Whittaker Chambers.

The CHAIRMAN. How about Budenz?

Mr. WECHSLER. I have different feelings about Mr. Budenz, but I would have to elaborate them at length. I don't believe an ex-Communist becomes a great writer merely because he is an ex-Communist. Neither do I think he ought to be regarded as a thief all his life because he was once a Communist.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you say you came to the defense of Chambers?

Mr. WECHSLER. I fought the battle of Chambers from one end of Georgetown to the other when I was a correspondent here.

The CHAIRMAN. You will submit that for the record?

Mr. WECHSLER. I will submit articles on the Hiss case.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not asking you to, but you said you wanted to submit them.

Mr. WECHSLER. I will, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever come to the defense of any other real anti-Communist who was exposing them, testifying before committees?

Mr. WECHSLER. Well, as editor of the Post, I do not know whether Eleanor Lipper was an ex-Communist or not. I believe she was. She wrote a series of articles about the Russian slave labor camps. That was one of the first series run in the Post under my editorship.

I don't argue—I would be rather silly to argue—that ex-Communists were by nature evil men, but I do insist that an ex-Communist should stand on his own feet as an American and say what he believes and fight for what he believes.

The CHAIRMAN. One other question.

Do you know any other people, either in Government or working in any organizations that are disseminating news, who are, as of today, members of the Communist Party and who have not been publicly exposed as such?

Mr. WECHSLER. No; I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know any people as of today who are either members of the Young Communist League or members of the Communist Party who have not been publicly exposed as such?

Mr. WECHSLER. Who are now, or were?

The CHAIRMAN. Who are now.

Mr. WECHSLER. I obviously do not, because my knowledge of the Young Communist League ends with late 1937.

The CHAIRMAN. The Communist Party?

Mr. WECHSLER. The Communist Party, obviously.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, your testimony is that as of today you know of no Communist Party members who have not been publicly exposed as members of the party?

Mr. WECHSLER. That is my offhand opinion, certainly with respect to Government. Whether there are people who once were Communists who have never been publicly before a committee—I haven't any doubt that is true. I suppose that would depend on what they were doing, what the relevance of their activity was.

The CHAIRMAN. Just one further question. Do you feel that Communists should be allowed to teach in our schools?

Mr. WECHSLER. Senator, I will answer you in this way. If I were the dean of a college, I would not hire a Communist teacher. As the editor of a newspaper, I would not hire a Communist journalist. I think that is as explicit as I can be. I think the reasons are fairly obvious. I could not trust their devotion to truth above their adherence to a party line.

The CHAIRMAN. If you were the president of a college or the editor of a newspaper, and if you knew of any Communists on your teaching staff or newspaper staff, you would discharge them if you could?

Mr. WECHSLER. Fortunately, I have not been confronted with the problem. I might have a serious Guild issue with respect to that problem. If I had been running PM at certain phases in its history, I would have taken very drastic steps to get the Communists off it. I fought like hell to get them off.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Cohn or Mr. Jackson?

Senator JACKSON. What is the union situation on Communists who are members of the Guild, Communist members of the Guild who work for a newspaper? Can the employer remove them under pressure?

Mr. WECHSLER. Sir, I believe that question has been decided differently in different arbitrations. I don't think there is a clear answer on the point. I think it might depend on the nature of the union contract in different shops.

I would say that as I read our contract, I would probably have great difficulty firing anyone, except for catching him in an overt act of putting the party line into the paper or distorting the news.

Senator JACKSON. But it would have to be on that basis?

Mr. WECHSLER. I would think so. But, as I say, I have been pretty fortunate.

Senator JACKSON. What about the composing room or the mechanical department?

Mr. WECHSLER. I believe that was the case—the most recent case that was decided on that point was in favor of an employer dismissing a man, but it was after he had messed up some type. I don't know of a precedent involving mere membership.

Senator JACKSON. If you know—I do not know whether you can answer this question—what is the situation at, say, General Electric at Schenectady? They have a bargaining contract, I believe, with the United Electrical Workers, which is a union that is obviously Communist dominated, if my recollection is correct. What can the management do?

Mr. WECHSLER. I think it is Jim Carey's position that the management can do a lot to encourage anti-Communist unionism. I do not believe the management can do anything except in connection with security as to atomic contracts.

Senator JACKSON. I meant in nonsecurity work.

Mr. WECHSLER. I don't believe they can do anything. But that is my offhand recollection.

Could I add just one more thing?

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to ask one more question.

Do you feel that a committee such as this has the right and duty to check the books by Communist authors on the information program shelves?

Mr. WECHSLER. Sir, I believe that the expedition of your associates was one of the most absurd and fantastic wastes of taxpayers' money in history, because I do not believe that the presence of one book on one shelf is going to be a decisive issue in the battle against Communist ideas. I would say that the New York Post has been not alone in suggesting that the journey did more to enable the Communists to ridicule us than anything that has happened in many years.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you get back to my question?

The question is: Do you feel that a committee such as this has the right and duty to check into the question of books by Communist authors on our book shelves throughout the world? We are not talking about one book. Let me finish the question. We are not talking about one book. We are talking about tens of thousands of books.

Mr. WECHSLER. I am sure the committee has the right to do so. I would question whether the committee was exercising great wisdom in its selection when it did so.

The CHAIRMAN. As I recall, and I may misquote this, because I do not read your sheet, I understand that you have been disturbed by the "unfair treatment" witnesses received before this committee.

Do you feel you were unfairly treated?

Mr. WECHSLER. Why, Senator, I question the basic nature of this proceeding. Of course I do.

The CHAIRMAN. You feel you are unfairly treated?

Mr. WECHSLER. I regard this proceeding as the first in a long line of attempts to intimidate editors who do not equate McCarthyism with patriotism.

The CHAIRMAN. You have not been intimidated, have you?

Mr. WECHSLER. Senator, I am a pretty tough guy.

The CHAIRMAN. I say, you have not been intimidated have you?

Mr. WECHSLER. I say this is the first of a long line of attempts to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Answer my question. Have you been intimidated?

Mr. WECHSLER. You are not going to win this argument, Senator. We will go back and forth all afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you been intimidated?

Mr. WECHSLER. Sir, I have been taken away from my work. I have not even had a chance to write a word today about Senator McCarthy.

The CHAIRMAN. You have not been intimidated at all, have you? You mean you have been inconvenienced.

The question is: Have you been intimidated?

Mr. WECHSLER. I am fully aware that this is a proceeding designed to smear the New York Post. I recognize that, Senator. We are both grown up. But this is a free country, and I am going to keep fighting.

The CHAIRMAN. So will the Daily Worker and every other Communist-line paper.

But have you been intimidated?

Mr. WECHSLER. I am afraid that is a question we would have to discuss with doctors and get all sorts of expert testimony on.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you cannot answer that question.

Mr. WECHSLER. I say there is not any doubt this is an attempt to intimidate me. I trust that I have the moral courage to stand up under it.

I trust that other editors will.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you feel that you may have been intimidated? Is there a doubt in your mind as to whether you have been intimidated?

Mr. WECHSLER. We will not know, Senator, until we see whether as editor of the Post I keep on fighting just as hard for the things I believe in as I have been. I think I will.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think you have been intimidated?

Mr. WECHSLER. I have great confidence in myself; so, at this moment, Senator, I feel I have not been intimidated.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you feel you have been abused?

Mr. WECHSLER. Why, of course I have been abused. The suggestion that my break with communism was not authentic is the greatest affront that you could recite anywhere. I have fought this battle a long time, longer than you have, Senator, and I have taken plenty of beatings from the Communists in the course of that fight. I gave up a job on PM at a time when my wife was going to have a child. That was the time of a fight on communism. So, I feel very strongly about this.

The CHAIRMAN. I may say, so that there is no doubt in your mind, so that you need not say that Senator McCarthy intimated or insinuated that you have not broken, I have been following your record, not as closely perhaps as I would if you were in Government, but, you being a newspaper editor, I have been following you somewhat. I am convinced you have done exactly what you would do if you were a member of the Communist Party, if you wanted to have a phony break and then use that phony break to the advantage of the Communist Party.

I feel that you have not broken with Communist ideals. I feel that you are serving them very, very actively. Whether you are doing it knowingly or not, that is in your own mind. I have no knowledge as to whether you have a card in the party.

Mr. WECHSLER. I appreciate that concession.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you are doing tremendous damage to America. When I find books by authors like yourself being purchased by the information program, we are going to check into them. I say this so you need not say, "McCarthy intimated or insinuated." McCarthy did not intimate; he said that he thinks Wechsler is still very, very valuable to the Communist Party.

Mr. WECHSLER. Senator, I should like to say before you leave that, under the standards you have established here this afternoon, the only way that I could in your view prove my devotion to America and the validity of my break with communism would be to come out in support of Senator McCarthy. This I do not plan to do.

The CHAIRMAN. That I am not asking you to do. If you ever did that, I would be worried about myself.

Mr. Jackson, will you take over as chairman at this point?

Mr. WECHSLER. Senator, may I add one thing for the record before we finish? Because I think it is again relevant to the suspicion that the Senator has so generously voiced. Two things.

First, I believe that it was in the year 1943 that 2 Polish Socialists named Alter and Ehrlich were murdered by the Communists. There was great debate in America at that time as to whether there should be public protests over this murder, because there was the feeling in some places that this might jeopardize the wartime alliance with Russia.

I want to say that I felt very strongly about that case. I believe that Jim Carey would be glad to testify, if the committee were interested, that at that time I helped him to prepare the speech which he delivered in New York City at a public meeting—one of the few public meetings—protesting this murder. I might add that I tried, with some minor success, to get PM to take judicial notice of this Communist murder. I feel rather strongly about it because there were a great many people at that time who felt that it was a violation of protocol to raise such a question in international relations.

I would be glad, as I say, to have Jim support me on that point.

I would like to say, in addition, that in 1948, or in the period after 1946 and in 1947, when Wallaceism was in flower, American liberalism faced its biggest challenge, in that the attempted Communist seizure of the liberal movement was then at its peak.

I want to say for the record that I was then one of the founders of Americans for Democratic Action, an organization whose anti-communism Senator McCarthy, I understand, would not accept, but which I think is accepted generally in the country, through its proclamations and its activities. I think that ADA and the work it did at that time did more to smash the American Communist threat than any single activity that I could describe within the last 10 years.

I think we took the liberal movement away from them.

I see that Mr. Cohn is yawning at this point; so I will not labor the point.

I would like to add just one thing further.

Mr. COHN. Don't interpret my yawns.

Mr. WECHSLER. Just one further thing. The Post has been fighting Senator McCarthy for a long time. Our editorial page, I am happy to say, has never wavered on this point. It is not going to change now, and I say again for the record that I answered freely here today because I do not believe that I have anything to hide or that the Post has anything to hide.

I regard this inquiry as a clear invasion of what used to be considered the newspaper's right to act and function independently. I am hopeful that there will be voices raised by newspapers throughout the country in protest against this inquiry, but I repeat again that, rather than give Senator McCarthy the opportunity to distort my stand on that principle, I have answered all questions here to the best of my knowledge and recollection.

Mr. COHN. I have a couple of questions I would like to ask.

Mr. Wechsler, just a few questions here. I am not quite clear on this.

Did you, at any time between the time you broke with the party in 1937, until 1948, go to the FBI and offer to give them what infor-

mation you might have to aid them in their fight against communism? I am not clear on that.

Mr. WECHSLER. I did not go to the FBI. I have said several times here that I was visited on several occasions by FBI men and by the representatives of other agencies with respect to individuals. I answered freely and to the best of my knowledge and gave whatever information I had.

Mr. COHN. I was just trying to clarify whether or not—

Mr. WECHSLER. As to the question of volunteering, which seems to have become a major one here, let me say that I, through the grace of God, was not privileged to be a member of any espionage society or sabotage ring while I was associated with the Young Communist League. The information I had, therefore, was of a somewhat less spectacular nature than a couple of other ex-Communists have had.

Mr. COHN. Now, in 1948, do I understand that you went for the purpose of making a statement to the FBI?

Mr. WECHSLER. I went to the FBI in 1948 because an FBI report had been submitted to Charles E. Wilson, the Wilson of General Electric, with regard to my wife.

The report was, as I have said, definitely not up to date. We clarified that report, and in the course of that interview, Mr. Nichols and I agreed that I would give him a detailed statement of both our personal histories. I gave it to him.

Mr. COHN. I see. Now, I wanted to ask you this. Talking about your efforts to get Communists out of government, what was the editorial policy of your paper in the Remington case?

Mr. WECHSLER. I do not believe that the Post had an editorial policy on the Remington case, because it seems to me that what I wrote about that case was written before I became editor of the Post. I would have to check this again.

Mr. COHN. Oh, no. You are quite wrong about that. They ran a considerable number of editorials about Remington. I read them, and I have them.

Mr. WECHSLER. Well, I would have to check them.

Mr. COHN. They are all favorable to Remington, incidentally.

Mr. WECHSLER. Let me state on the record, since you have raised this, that my position on the Remington case was a perfectly simple one.

When Remington was first accused, long before the proceeding got near the courts, he went to Joe Rauh, and asked Joe to be his lawyer. Rauh spent some hours with Remington examining and cross-examining him, and finally became persuaded that Remington had not been, as charged, a member of the Communist Party or the Young Communist League.

I was convinced, on the basis of Joe's examination, that this was a case worthy of journalistic interest.

Let me say that the most active part I took in the case was in covering an aspect of the story which strengthened my original feeling about it. That aspect was the refusal of Elizabeth Bentley to testify under oath before the Loyalty Review Board, a refusal which brought a denunciation from Seth Richardson, the late Seth Richardson, Chairman of the Board.

Mr. COHN. He was a member of the Board that cleared Remington, who was convicted by two juries after that.



Mr. WECHSLER. I believe he was. He was also a distinguished Republican attorney.

Mr. COHN. Well, I am a Democrat. That doesn't make much difference, whether he is a Republican or a Democrat. The fact is that he is on a board that cleared Remington, and Remington was convicted by two juries in a row.

Mr. WECHSLER. The Remington case is still pending in the courts. Is that right?

Mr. COHN. I had been under that impression, but I believe he surrendered—

Mr. WECHSLER. The procedure is that there was a delay in filing the appeals, as I understand it.

Mr. COHN. I didn't follow the details. I think at the time sentence was imposed, he was granted bail. I prosecuted the first case. I don't remember the second case.

Senator JACKSON. I do not think there has been a commitment.

Mr. COHN. I just read in the papers that he went to jail. I didn't know the details.

Let me ask you this: You have testified before that if you had known any Communist in Government you would have done something about that.

You say Bill Hinckley was in the Young Communist League with you. He was in Government after that. When he was in Government, did you go to the FBI or some place and tell them he had been in the league with you?

Mr. WECHSLER. In the first place, let me say, on Hinckley, as I said before, that Hinckley was a member of the group with which I was identified. Whether he held a card or not, I could not say, because there wasn't a formal procedure. I would say he was being extremely disingenuous if he stood on that procedure.

My first awareness of what Hinckley was doing was when Hinckley was teaching in Maryland.

Mr. COHN. In other words, your testimony is that you didn't know he was in government.

Mr. WECHSLER. I didn't know anything about him until I read it in the paper.

Mr. COHN. If you had known about his being in government you would certainly have communicated—

Mr. WECHSLER. I certainly would not have withheld any information. Let me add, on that point, that there were many stages in the Communist problem in government, as you are well aware, and at the peak of the wartime alliance, there were Communists, as I have said, in the European theater, under General Clay, and he had somewhat higher rank than I did.

Mr. COHN. Now, the last question I want to ask you is this: You told us about your break in 1937. Our records here show that in 1940, on two occasions, you were the signer of things published in the Daily Worker.

Let me see what this is. One appears to be a letter protesting the action of the executive board of the American Civil Liberties Union in barring Communists from office, which was published on March 19, 1940, in the Daily Worker.

Do you recall that?

Mr. WECHSLER. This has come up in the Lait-Mortimer deposition. I have no recollection of signing it, but let me add that I think it is perfectly conceivable that I did. With respect to civil-liberties issues, I am a rather passionate civil libertarian. I would take positions on the Smith Act that probably wouldn't accord with yours.

Mr. COHN. Are you opposed to the Smith Act?

Mr. WECHSLER. I have written numerous editorials denouncing legislation which deals with advocacy rather than acts.

Mr. COHN. You don't think that the leaders of the Communist Party go as far as acts?

Mr. WECHSLER. I think that that isn't the question. I am for any proceeding dealing with acts.

And let me add that my basic opinion is that the leaders of the Communist Party are agents of a foreign power, and had they been so prosecuted I should not have quarreled with the prosecution.

Mr. COHN. There is another record we have, April 2, 1940, in the New Masses. Did you sign any letter published in the New Masses in April 1940?

Mr. WECHSLER. I have been asked about this, and the only thing I might have signed would be a letter opposing the outlawing of the New Masses.

There, again, let me say that I am against the outlawing of propaganda as such. I would be now. I do not recall the circumstances of signing such a document.

Mr. COHN. Let me ask you this as the last question.

Were you aware of the fact that any of your books were used in the information program?

Mr. WECHSLER. No, I was not. I am rather flattered.

Mr. COHN. Do you think that the first two books should be used in the information program?

Mr. WECHSLER. Only if they were used as objects of curiosity. I would not be in favor of syndicating them in the New York Post at the present time.

Mr. COHN. But the last two books, you would say, were all right?

Mr. WECHSLER. I would stand on them.

Mr. COHN. Do you know Reed Harris, by any chance?

Mr. WECHSLER. I knew Reed Harris very slightly at college. I was a freshman at the time that he was a senior.

Mr. COHN. Do you know whether or not he was a Communist?

Mr. WECHSLER. To the best of my knowledge, he was not a Communist.

Mr. COHN. Let me ask you this. What I have reference to is a circular of the American Student Union. I think we asked you about this on a prior occasion. It lists you as chairman for the American Student Union, of some alumni homecoming gathering, and lists Reed Harris as a member of the sponsoring committee.

Was Harris a member of the American Student Union at that time?

Mr. WECHSLER. I do not believe that he could have been, because he graduated from college in 1931.

This dinner was a group brought together for one occasion, of many men of different age, but it had nothing to do with membership in the Student Union.

Senator JACKSON. Was that limited to students in school?

Mr. WECHSLER. Yes, sir. This was a dinner designed actually to raise money.

Senator JACKSON. As I understand, on that list there were a number of people. Some were Communists, and some were not Communists.

Mr. WECHSLER. Well, there were some very valiant anti-Communists as of that date on the list. And I would like to say, on that point, Senator, as long as we are making a record here, that to men like Norman Thomas and others on that list, who were vigorous anti-Communists, but who did help us in those days, I have a great personal debt. Because I think the fact that they didn't cast us into the outer darkness helped a lot of us see through the Communist business fairly early in our lives. And that function was an occasion on which they were—

Senator JACKSON. What is the date of that? 1937?

Mr. COHN. That is 1937, Senator.

Senator JACKSON. And you left the party, or the Young Communist League, in that year?

Mr. WECHSLER. Yes.

Mr. COHN. You were never a member of the Party, were you?

Mr. WECHSLER. No, as a matter of fact, and I do not cite this as something to stand on, membership in those days was a rather elusive concept. We didn't have party cards.

Mr. COHN. I think you said it was a matter of age.

Mr. WECHSLER. It was entirely a matter of age, the distinction between membership and the YCL, although the programs were ostensibly different.

Senator JACKSON. You will submit the other matters?

Mr. WECHSLER. Yes.

I want to say again that I have a sense of futility in submitting it, since Senator McCarthy has announced he doesn't read my works, but maybe other members of the committee will.

Senator JACKSON. I think these matters should be included as exhibits anyway.

Mr. WECHSLER. I think these are just duplicates of stuff that you got.

Senator JACKSON. I think it may be better if you go over it a little later and get it all together so that the record will be complete here.

Mr. WECHSLER. All right.

Do you want to give me back the ones I have turned in?

Or do you mean to supplement them?

Senator JACKSON. To supplement the books and documents previously mentioned.

Mr. WECHSLER. I did say I would enter that. That is the 1942 article from the Daily Worker.

(Whereupon, at 5:40 p. m. Friday, April 24, 1953, the hearing was recessed to the call of the Chair.)

# APPENDIX

---

## EXHIBITS

---

### EXHIBIT No. 15

[From the Congressional Record, June 9, 1952]

#### LETTER FROM JAMES A. WECHSLER

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a very interesting letter from Mr. James A. Wechsler, editor of the New York Post, giving the facts in regard to certain statements recently made in the Senate. This letter will, I believe, be of interest to every Member of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NEW YORK POST,  
*New York, N. Y., June 4, 1952.*

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,  
*United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: On page 6056 of the Congressional Record, dated May 26, 1952, Senator McCarthy has a brief discussion of me in which, among other things, he says:

"This is the same Wechsler, incidentally, who is now editor of the New York Post, and who admits that he was a Communist until some time in the late 1930's. He claims to have reformed since then, but has never, so far as we know, shown any indication of his reformation."

This is not the first occasion on which Senator McCarthy has made this point. On October 2, 1951, he said substantially the same thing before the Committee on Foreign Relations. At that time I wired the following statement to Senator Sparkman:

"In connection with Senator McCarthy's attack on the New York Post and myself, I would deeply appreciate the insertion of the following statement in the record of your committee's hearings:

"The New York Post recently published a documented series of 17 articles on Senator McCarthy. These articles critically evaluated his record both before and after his election to the Senate. Nearly 2 weeks have passed since the publication of those articles and Senator McCarthy has not taken issue with a single fact published in them. A newspaper, as you know, has no immunity; it assumes full responsibility for anything it publishes.

"Instead of challenging the articles Senator McCarthy has chosen to make a personal attack on the editor of the Post and to imply that only a subversive newspaper could have published this series.

"I'm sure that Senator McCarthy knows that the Post is a militantly anti-Communist newspaper. I am sure he knows that the Communist Daily Worker has frequently denounced both the Post and its editor. I am sure that he knows that the Post and its editor warmly support the efforts of the United States Government to resist Communist aggression through military action in Korea, through the organization of the North Atlantic defense forces, and through economic aid to nations menaced by Communist imperialism. Naturally these are all matters of public record, as are the editorial denunciations of the Post which appear almost daily in the Communist press. Nevertheless Senator McCarthy chose to tell your committee that "Their (the Post) editorials parallel the Daily Worker's editorials." He has further attempted to discredit factual

material published in the Post about him by questioning the loyalty of the Post's editor.

"I have never made any secret of my youthful Communist associations. They were ended in 1937 when I was 22 years old; may I add that I ended those associations long before Whittaker Chambers, Elizabeth Bentley, and Louis Budenz did so. I have actively and publicly opposed Communist totalitarianism since that time. It is a matter of public record that in 1946 I resigned from the newspaper PM with a public statement explaining that I felt compelled to leave because the newspaper was Communist dominated. Prior to that time I was known to be one of those engaged in a long effort to eliminate Communist influence on the paper and in the American Newspaper Guild. In 1948 I was one of the founders of Americans for Democratic Action which, as you know, is an actively anti-Communist liberal organization and specifically excludes Communists as well as other totalitarians from membership. I am a member of the national executive committee of ADA.

"Since Senator McCarthy has also seen fit to attack my wife, may I add that she resigned from the Young Communist League in 1937 at the age of 21 and has similarly engaged in public anti-Communist activity since that time.

"I regret the necessity for this extended statement but I believe it will be of interest to the members of your committee in view of Senator McCarthy's suggestion that the New York Post's exposure of him was a party-line attack. I would, of course, be delighted to make these statements under oath if the committee so desired."

At the time that I transmitted this statement to Senator Sparkman I offered to present it under oath, but he informed me that it was the view of the subcommittee that that would not be necessary. I am, of course, willing at any time to do so. But, in fact, as I noted in my statement, much of my answer to Senator McCarthy is on the public record—both in my own writings and public statements and the attacks which the Communists have leveled against me for more than a decade. I might add that any professed expert on communism—such as Senator McCarthy—ought to know that the Communist Daily Worker's attacks on the Post and myself have grown even more intense in recent months because of the Post's continued support of the effort of the free nations to resist the Communist aggression.

I find it hard to believe that all this material has eluded Senator McCarthy. However, in view of the fact that his newest attack on me has been published in the Congressional Record, I wonder if it would be possible for you to insert this letter into the Record for the benefit of Members of Congress who have read the McCarthy charge. Since many of them do not see the New York Post, I feel it is important to bring these facts before them.

I realize that I am only one of many anti-Communist newspaper editors whom Senator McCarthy has denounced because they refused to condone his methods. I am sure that most Members of Congress will agree that editors so attacked in the pages of the Congressional Record should have an opportunity to reply in the same publication. I will be very grateful if you can see fit to introduce this into the Record.

Sincerely,

JIMMY WECHSLER.

---

EXHIBIT No. 16

[From the New York Post, January 23, 1950]

THE TRIAL OF ALGER HISS

Alger Hiss stands convicted by a jury of his countrymen. The long drama that began in a congressional hearing room when Hiss first convincingly protested his innocence has reached its climax. Is the ordeal over? Hiss will appeal and until that proceeding runs its course the case is not closed. Some friends and partisans of the defendant will remain unshaken by the verdict. The sense persists, even among many who do not question the jury's finding, that some aspect of the story remains untold, that some human links are missing even if the legal pieces have been put together. Speculation about the case will fill the literature of our lifetime.

Certainly Whittaker Chambers is justified in viewing the decision as personal vindication. In the final moments, as throughout the long conflict, the crucial issue was: Which of the two men lied? Twelve men and women found "beyond a reasonable doubt" that it was Hiss who lied. In the last chapter nothing the

defense could offer effectively refuted the mute testimony of the typewriter and the documents. No psychiatric disclosure could prove the Woodstock was the creature of a tortured imagination or that Hiss' handwriting revealed the "psychopathic personality" of his accuser; the silent evidence rested impassively on the table in the courtroom, neither glancing at the ceiling nor shifting nervously in its seat.

#### THE GREAT DEBATE

Why does the debate continue? Perhaps partly because there were inconsistencies of detail on both sides and because no human being offered corroborative (or defense) testimony as devastating as the inanimate objects which relentlessly demanded the defendant. Yet this gap alone would not explain the fascination the trial has held for our generation. Why did it matter so much? Why were so many men and women impelled to take sides? The answer may be that this was a trial which cut through the history of our time and almost everyone responsive to the century's turmoil felt a personal involvement in the clash.

To fanatic reactionaries and devout Communists the issues were always simplest. The analysts of the far right assumed Hiss' guilt from the moment he was charged. This was what they had been waiting for. It confirmed—to them—all their nightmare prejudices about the New Deal. Obviously men who had pictured Franklin D. Roosevelt as a tool or agent of Communists were enthusiastically prepared to condemn Hiss without trial; his ties with the New Deal were intrinsic proof of the charges. What could be more logical (they cried) than that Hiss should have served the Russians in international intrigue? All the dark imaginings of a Hearst cartoon sprang to life. This was it; the details were unimportant. As for the Communists, their "double think" device settled all arguments. They could publicly picture Hiss as another victim of capitalist injustice, target of a shameless frameup for his New Deal labors. Privately they could tell each other it was a measure of our decline that a man was being hounded for transmitting information to anti-Fascist Russia more than a decade ago.

Not only extremists, however, were absorbed in the trial. Many moderate liberals and conservatives ardently identified themselves with the defense. The nature of the onslaught against Hiss partially explained the support of some of his former New Deal colleagues; they could not help feeling that they, too, were under attack. That alone does not explain the depth of pro-Hiss feeling among many liberals. Nor does it throw any light on the attachment for Hiss' cause found among many enlightened Republicans.

#### THE AGE OF INNOCENCE

Liberal partisanship, we think was a throwback to the era of the Popular Front. Faith in Soviet Russia was the grand illusion of American liberalism in the span between two world wars. Until the signing of the Nazi-Soviet pact thousands of Americans clung to the belief that the Russian regime, however oppressive at home, was the world's last great anti-Fascist hope. Embittered by Chamberlain and Daladier, they accepted the Kremlin's self-portrait of international virtue; they magnified democratic decadence and glorified the Russian foreign office. If Chambers' charges against Hiss were sustained, the story was a grotesque, intolerable footnote to that age of innocence. Hiss' performance, as described by Chambers, became a ruthless caricature of wide-eyed romanticism during the Popular Front years; it revealed that the grand illusion contained the seeds of treason. To many who had accepted the premises of that united-front epoch, the conclusion that Hiss was guilty was unbearable; they had to believe he was innocent of the clandestine role ascribed to him or confess they might have been guilty of the same terrible folly—"There but for the grace of God \* \* \*". Ironically, contemporary fellow travelers, reenacting the error of collaboration with the Communists, have been peculiarly incapable of accepting Chambers' story. Their key article of faith is the Communists are an overzealous, but well-intentioned species of native radical; they do not want to be told even at this late date the Communist movement is, among other things, a unit of Soviet espionage.

The emotional investment of some thoughtful conservatives in Hiss' defense is no less noteworthy. Hiss personified the promising American, starred for success. His college classmates voted him "most likely to succeed." He rose swiftly; his grace and intelligence impressed nearly everyone who met him. The notion that a man of his breeding and background aided a Soviet spy ring was unthink-

able; it was almost as if the honor of the Ivy League were at stake and men rallied to the defense of one of their own against a moody mystic who had admittedly toiled in the Communist underground. All this may have reflected a profound uneasiness among conservatives. If Hiss, so clearly destined for success in the conventional world, was stirred even momentarily by the Communist mirage, his shift of allegiance was an implied criticism of our own society. Only "psychopaths" could be radicals in the conservative scheme of things; to men who believe we have already constructed the best of all possible worlds, there was a terrifying imponderable in Hiss' alleged defection. If he had lost faith in our way of life, nothing was secure; therefore—the sequitur is vague—he must be innocent.

Finally there were sophisticated anti-Stalinists who never conceded any area of doubt in the Hiss-Chambers duel. They saw his guilt as vindication of their warnings. Dismayed by wistful suggestions that it was incredible that a man of Hiss' stature could be entrapped by the Communists, they often spoke as though it were inevitable that he had been. But it was neither incredible nor inevitable and the world's fate did not hinge on the outcome.

## FOOTNOTE TO A TRIAL

Each man simply evolved his own theory according to his own preconceptions; each became a vicarious participant in the trial. Now the extreme right rejoices and the "double think" Communists cry frameup, even as they search for espionage recruits among young men groping for absolutist assurances. Thoughtful men will avoid the celebrations and shrill outcries. Guilty as charged, Hiss is a tragic, lonely figure, caught in the debris of the grand illusion that Communist Russia would save the world. His ordeal is not over; reason, justice, and compassion plead that minds remain flexible until his last appeal is heard.

Meanwhile, amid the raucous thunder on the right, it needs to be said that the conviction of Alger Hiss does not prove that the Wagner Act was a subversive statute, that minimum-wage laws were un-American, that resistance to Hitlerism was a Communist plot, and the New Deal a Kremlin blueprint. If anything, we are challenged more dramatically than ever before to make our society worthy of the loyalty and idealism of its promising young men and to give freedom the noble quality of a fighting faith.

## EXHIBIT No. 17

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C., January 30, 1950.

Mr. JAMES WECHSLER,  
Editor, *New York Post*,  
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. WECHSLER: This is just a note to tell you that I thought your editorial on the Hiss case, published in your issue of January 23, was one of the most able and fair appraisals of a very difficult problem which I have seen.

Since you probably have me categorized as one of the "reactionaries" mentioned in your editorial, I thought you might be particularly interested in my reaction.

With all good wishes,  
Sincerely yours,

RICHARD NIXON, *Member of Congress.*

## EXHIBIT No. 20

[Excerpt from *New York Times*, June 15, 1946]

FIVE QUIT PM SAYING REDS SWAY EDITOR—ALMOST ENTIRE WASHINGTON BUREAU ACCUSES INGERSOLL OF INTOLERANCE, EXPLOITATION

[Special to the *New York Times*]

WASHINGTON, June 14.—Five members of PM's Washington bureau—the entire staff but one—quit today and accused Ralph Ingersoll, editor, of yielding to Communist pressure, using the paper for personal exploitation, illiberalism, and intolerance.

The five are: James Wechsler, Nathan Robertson, Wilbur Baldinger, Charles Michie, and Bianca Meiklejohn. The resignations left Gordon Cole as the lone remaining correspondent in the bureau.

The mass resignation, effective immediately, was precipitated by an arbitrator's decision yesterday upholding Mr. Ingersoll's dismissal of three other PM Washington correspondents "for economy," but the genesis of the ill will between the bureau members and their editor antedates those dismissals and is traceable largely to issues of editorial policy.

The three who were dismissed are Milton Murray, president of the American Newspaper Guild, CIO; Elizabeth Donahue, and John Mouttoux.

The five said in a signed statement that they did not question the integrity of the arbitrator's decision, but added that "the situation confronting us was much broader than the dispute involved in the arbitration.

"We believe," they declared, "Ingersoll's policy not only endangers the future of PM but is a disservice to independent liberal journalism in America." They declared their faith in Marshall Field, PM's president, as "an honest and courageous American."

None would say what their plans were, except that they expected to remain in journalism. Messrs. Wechsler, Robertson, and Michie had been employees of PM even before publication began on June 18, 1940. Mr. Webster had been chief of the Washington bureau but relinquished his managerial duties recently after refusing to discharge Mr. Murray, and Mr. Mouttoux, and Miss Donahue.

The five who resigned issued this statement:

"We have resigned from the newspaper PM today.

"We do so with deep reluctance and regret. But we cannot in good conscience continue to work for Ralph Ingersoll.

"The arbitrator's decision yesterday, upholding the dismissals of three PM employees 'for economy' is, of course, final. We do not question the integrity of that decision. But it had become increasingly apparent to those of us who are not directly affected by the decision that we could not remain on the paper under Ingersoll's editorship and that the situation confronting us was much broader than the dispute involved in the arbitration.

"We believe Ingersoll's policy not only endangers the future of PM but is a disservice of independent liberal journalism in America.

"His illiberalism and intolerance has offended many people who sympathized with the professed aims of the paper. He has repeatedly 'pushed other people around' in flagrant violation of PM's own editorial credo. Ingersoll's use of PM as an organ for personal exploitation has embarrassed all of us who feel that the newspaper should not be a vehicle for private aggrandizement of its editor.

"Although not himself a Communist, he has continuously yielded to Communist pressure and has denounced as factionists those staff members who have tried to keep the party line out of the paper.

"He has destroyed the confidence of those who believe that PM should be as realistic and critical in its coverage and examination of Russian foreign policy as in its evaluation of the foreign policy of our own Government.

"Ever since his return to active editorship he has carried on a petty and vindictive campaign against the Washington bureau which has prided itself on its independence of any political pressure.

"We believe there is a real place in America for a newspaper fulfilling the proclaimed ideas of PM. Three of the undersigned have remained on the paper since its inception, 6 years ago, because we hoped that mission could be fulfilled. We hope our resignations will help to persuade the board of directors to recognize the peril facing PM as a result of Ingersoll's irrational and irresponsible policies, climaxed by the drastic reduction of the Washington bureau.

"We especially regret any embarrassment our action may cause to Marshall Field, an honest and courageous American. But we cannot in fairness to Mr. Field remain on PM under Ingersoll's editorship and we feel obligated to explain to those who have loyally supported PM why we now feel compelled to resign."

#### FIVE RESIGNATIONS ACCEPTED

The newspaper PM announced last night that it had accepted the resignations of five members of its Washington bureau and would continue its reports through remaining members and the files of the Chicago Sun, the Associated Press, and the United Press.

A statement by the management said:

"In accordance with a telegraphed request, the resignations of four members of the PM Washington staff plus an office secretary have been accepted. The



office will continue to operate under the direction of Frank Bear, national editor, who has divided his time between Washington and New York since James Wechsler resigned as chief of the Washington bureau on May 7.

"Coverage of Washington news will be continued as usual under Mr. Bear and the others of the Washington staff: Alexander H. Uhl, Gordon Cole, and I. F. Stone. Mr. Stone has been on a special assignment abroad and is returning in about 2 weeks. PM will continue to receive the Washington report of the Chicago Sun, the Associated Press, and the United Press."

John T. McManus, president of the Newspaper Guild of New York, disassociated the New York unit from the resignation of the 5 PM Washington employees and said it was something that should be considered apart from "the determined fight" the New York Guild had put up on behalf of 3 writers who were discharged. Mr. McManus was reached in Scranton, Pa., where he is attending a meeting of the international executive board of the American Newspaper Guild, CIO, preparatory to a convention next week.

While accepting the report of the arbitrator upholding PM's contention of economy discharges, Mr. McManus said the guild was disappointed with the finding and did not feel it did justice to the three individuals involved.

---

#### EXHIBIT No. 21

[From the Daily Worker, December 22, 1942]

### THE POLITICAL SCENE

#### PM AND COMMUNISTS

(By Milton Howard)

The nervous self-consciousness of certain PM writers about the Communist Party is interfering with that paper's accuracy in sheer news reporting. Anti-Communist prejudice is warping the facts with growing frequency.

PM's readers are already familiar with its piece of journalistic sleight-of-hand in which it recently translated the imprisonment of Jan Valtin for his associations with the Nazi Gestapo into an "anti-Communist" report in which the word Nazi did not appear at all.

Anti-Communist jitters, in this case, resulted in a distortion. PM's readers were not informed of the sheer facts in the case.

That this is no isolated incident, but springs from some deep well-spring of political prejudice, is indicated by the loony demand of PM's Washington bureau chief, Kenneth Crawford, that the Communist Party "dissolve itself." Mr. Crawford says that this would deprive Martin Dies of a bad word—communism—with which to club the liberals, and therefore their lives (the liberals) would be more comfortable.

Then, there is the case of James W. Wechsler, an ex-Communist, who, in his work in PM's Washington bureau, displays the typical jitters of an "ex" since he is never quite sure that the Dies committee or the influential people he wants to impress will accept his conversion at its face value.

Wechsler suffers especially since the Dies committee launched the cry that some "Communists" announce their desertion of "communism" only the better to propagate their "communism." (In this view, even the abolition of poll tax is described as "communism.")

Such chronic suspicion of "ex-Communists" is, of course, an occupational hazard of that tribe which would have only a private clinical interest, were it not for the fact that Wechsler, apparently, is a determining voice in PM's political policies.

For example, both Crawford and Wechsler of PM's Washington bureau spread the viewpoint that the landing of American troops in Africa constituted a rebuke to the popular movement for a second front in Europe, and, from now on, the people had better keep quiet and refuse to be organized into any other movements concerning the war.

Wechsler, writing this time in the December issue of the American Newspaper Guild, used the brilliant American offensive in Africa to belabor his favorite point—that something should be done to the "Communists."

He attacked the democratic mass movement for an attack on Hitler as made up of "angry resolutions \* \* \* bitter whisperings \* \* \* and ugly hints.

That the second-front movement always was and still is, the movement for supporting Roosevelt and Churchill against the defeatists who seek to delay any offensive whatsoever—this obvious fact is twisted into its opposite by PM's Wechsler. From Wechsler's point of view, our invasion of Africa is a confirmation not of the people's feeling that attack was superior to defense as a tactic, but a confirmation of Wechsler's special political line that the people ought not to help the Government against its enemies. If Wechsler is right, then there is no longer a fifth column in America, and Roosevelt no longer has any enemies against whom he needs the people's support. Which is clearly untrue.

It is a curious thing that it is in the name of unity that Wechsler preaches this doctrine of mass inertia in the face of quisling propaganda.

Those who urged an offensive strategy, he says, did so because "they seat themselves vicariously in the seat of the Kremlin" and "are the real foes of national solidarity."

Wechsler pictures an attack upon Hitler as being solely a "Kremlin" demand, thus besmirching the government's United Nations' alliance and urging a "no-attack-on-Hitler" policy in the same breath.

To prove his view that only by refusing to fight the anti-government intrigues of the defeatists does not prove one's national solidarity. Wechsler cites the case of the recent CIO convention. At this convention, he writes, the "leftists" were prepared to attack Philip Murray and disrupt the CIO with their second front campaign: "He (Murray) hadn't joined the second front clamor. He would have to be told off. \* \* \*" But the CIO was saved from an internal split by the African offensive. "All the angry resolutions and ugly hints are thrown out of court."

But here again, PM's Wechsler is quite inaccurate. For while Mr. Wechsler was eagerly anticipating a CIO fight against the second front, CIO President Murray had already, in his prepared official report, stated the labor movement's support for the second front.

Murray, further, warned the CIO convention:

"There are appeasers and agents of Hitler who seek to challenge the decisions of our leaders to put into effect the people's earnest desire for the supreme offensive—the second front—which must carry the United Nations to victory. The reasons offered are couched in terms of hesitation, weakness, and defeatism" (report, p. 8).

Thus Philip Murray slapped down the Wechslers.

It was not the "leftists" who were dismayed by the African operation; it was Wechsler who boasts "I stick by the confused and chaotic people" instead of the firm lead of the labor movement. Wechsler had been hoping for and working a split. The opening of the offensive disappointed his hope.

But is it fair to PM's readers that Wechsler's private worries as a renegade Communist should produce inaccurate reporting?

It is due to Wechsler's influence that PM, alone of all the New York newspapers, suppressed from its news report Premier Sikorski's warning: "The Germans will try to frighten the democracies by the threat of bolshevism. \* \* \*"

Why did PM cut this crucial passage out of its reporting?

We think that this jittery group in PM's staff which warps news to conform to its desire to conciliate Martin Dies ought to heed these words of a public man who sees the danger of red-baiting.

"I believe that anyone who lets his fear of communism warp his judgment is really very insecure in his love for and confidence in real democracy."

Marshall Field, the owner of PM, said that last week.

# INDEX

---

	Page
Alter	277
American Civil Liberties Union	279
American Newspaper Guild	270, 274, 283, 286, 287
American Society of Newspaper Editors	256
American Student Union	255, 269, 280
American Youth Congress	259
Americans for Democratic Action (ADA)	277, 283
Associated Press	286, 287
Baldinger, Wilbur	286
Bear, Frank	287
Bendiner, Robert	257, 258
Benliner	257
Bentley, Elizabeth	278, 283
Berstein, Colonel	263, 264
Budenz, Louis	273, 283
Carey, Jim	274, 277
Casey, James	259, 260
Chamberlain	284
Chambers, Whittaker	273, 283, 285
Chicago Sun	286, 287
CIO	264, 286, 287, 288
Clay, General	264, 279
Cole, Gordon	287
Columbia University	269
Compass	265
Crawford, Kenneth	287
Daily Worker	257, 259, 262, 271, 272, 276, 279, 281, 282, 283, 287
Daladier	284
De Voto, Bernard	267
Dies, Martin	271, 287, 288
Donahue, Elizabeth	286
Dubinsky	257
Ehrlich	277
ETO	264
Field, Marshall	286, 288
Foreign Relations Committee	282
General Electric	274, 278
Green, Gill	255
Harris, Reed	280
Hearst	284
Hinckley, Bill	267, 279
Hiss, Alger	261, 273, 283, 284, 285
Hoover, J. Edgar	260
Howard, Milton	287
Ingersoll, Ralph	271, 285, 286
Ivy League	285
Jenner, Bill	262, 263
Kempton, Murray	257, 259
Lait-Mortimer	280
Lash, Joseph R.	254, 259, 260
Lavine, Harold	254
Lawson, Arthur	255
Lehman, Herbert H.	282
Lewis, John L.	254, 268
Lewis, John P.	264, 265
Lipper, Eleanor	273

	Page
Loyalty Review Board.....	278
Marshall.....	271
McManus.....	287
Meiklejohn, Bianca.....	286
Michie, Charles.....	286
Moultoux, John.....	286
Murray, Milton.....	286
Murray, Philip.....	288
Nation.....	269, 270
New Masses.....	257, 280
New York Post.....	256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 265, 268, 271, 273, 275, 276, 277, 278, 280, 282, 283, 285
New York Times.....	262, 269, 271, 272, 285
Newspaper Guild of New York.....	287
Nichols, Lou.....	260, 266, 267, 278
Nixon, Richard.....	261, 285
Nixon, Russ.....	264
PM Magazine.....	265, 270, 271, 272, 274, 276, 277, 285, 286, 287, 288
President's Committee on Civil Rights.....	265
Progressive.....	262
Rauh, Joe.....	278
Remington.....	278, 279
Reuther.....	257
Richardson, Seth.....	278
Robertson, Nathan.....	286
Robertson, Nate.....	271
Roosevelt, Franklin D.....	284, 288
Rushmore, Mr.....	253, 259, 270, 272
Sikorski, Premier.....	272, 288
Smith Act.....	280
Social Democratic Federation.....	257, 259, 260
Sparkman, Senator.....	282, 283
Stalin, Joe.....	262, 269
Stevenson, Adlai.....	273
Stone, I. F.....	287
Strack, Celeste.....	267
Thackrey.....	265
Thomas, Norman.....	281
Time Magazine.....	269
Truman, President.....	257, 271
Uhl, Alexander H.....	287
Un-American Activities Committee.....	261, 262
United Electrical Workers.....	274
United Press.....	286, 287
Valtin, Jan.....	287
Velde.....	263
Wagner.....	285
Waldman, Louis.....	260
Wallace.....	267, 277
Wechsler, James A.....	282, 283, 286, 287, 288
Testimony of.....	253, 281
White, Harry Dexter.....	263, 264
Wilson, Charles E.....	278
Witt, Bert.....	267
Young Communist League.....	254, 255 256, 257, 258, 262, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 273, 278, 279, 281, 283



